

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 5, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-8 were pending and rejected claims 1-8. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended without narrowing the claims, no claims have been canceled, new claim 9 has been added; and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-9 are pending for consideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

On page 2, item 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Office Action, on page 2, asserted that "caption character strings" and "title character string", as recited in claim 1, for example, are not well known in the art and are not appropriately defined in the Specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with an argument. First, "caption character string" is referred to in the Specification, on page 7 lines 8-17, and in Figure 2 as part of a file name. Second, "title character string" is referred to in the Specification, on page 4 lines 12-18 and page 11, as a character string shown in the title bar of a window. Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art would understand the meaning of "caption character string" and "title character string" by reading the Specification and the Figures.

The Office Action, on page 3, asserted that the claim language "is displayed on said display device", as recited in claims 1 and 5, is unclear. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to further clarify that the function restricting target window is displayed on the display device.

Further, the Office Action, on page 3, asserted that the claim language "with respect to a caption character string coincident with a title character string of the function restricting target window in a case where the function restricting target window is defined as a window of which the title character string is coincident with any one of the caption character strings", as recited in claims 1 and 5, is unclear as to what is being compared. Applicant respectfully submits that the above mentioned claim language is clear since claim 1, for example, clearly recites "said computer...does not execute respective processes of which executions are not permitted by inhibited process designating information contained in the security policy information **with respect to a caption character string coincident with a title character string of the function restricting target window** in a case where the function restricting targeting window...is displayed on said display device." Claim 5 also recites a similar feature as to clearly indicate what is being compared. Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art would

clearly understand that "caption character string" and "title character string of the function restricting target window" are being compared.

Thus, based upon the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-8 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

On page 4, item 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oe (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0099837).

Oe relates to an information processing system for controlling computer resources. Specifically, an operation request from a process or OS for computer resource is managed by the OS, such as a file, and is trapped before access to the computer resource is allowed. If the access for the computer resource designated by the trapped operation request is present, the operation request is transferred to the operating system and as a result the operation request is returned to the request source process. However, if access is not present, the operation request is denied (see Oe, Abstract). Moreover, as described in Fig. 3 of Oe, an access management table is designed to be able to register resource designation information, condition, and n pieces of access information for each resource. The resource designation information designates a specific one of the resources managed by the general purpose OS. The condition represents a condition or combination of conditions under which the access is validated. Stated another way, Oe describes a system which sets the security level information to each file (see Oe, paragraphs [0223] and [0348] and Fig. 8).

However, claim 1, for example, recites "making, on the basis of security policy information..., **the computer operate as a device that does not execute respective processes of which executions are not permitted...with respect to a caption character string coincident with a title character string of the function restricting target window...where the function restricting target window...is displayed on said display device.**" Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Oe does not teach or suggest the aforementioned features as recited in claim 1, for example. Rather, Oe describes a system which sets the security level information to each file instead of restricting execution with respect to a caption character string which coincides with a title character string of the function restricting target window.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Oe. Further, claim 5 recites similar features as mentioned above with respect to claim 1 and, therefore, patentably distinguishes over Oe for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 patentably distinguish over Oe for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all rejections.

New claim 9 has been added to emphasize displaying a function restricting target window when the computer is restricted from executing respective processes with respect to a caption character string that is coincident with a title character string of a function restricting target window. Therefore, claim 9 patentably distinguishes over Oe.

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 5, 2007

By: 

John C. Garvey  
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501